DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 154 058 UD 017 969

TITLE Asian American Assembly Position Paper: II. A Review of U.S. Employment Policy. Occasional Papers/Reprint Series in Contemporary Asian Studies, No. 12.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., Baltimore. School of Law
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 27p.
AVAILABLE FROM Professor Hungdah Chiu, University of Maryland School of Law, 500 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201 ($1.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affirmative Action; *Asian Americans; Attitudes; *Chinese Americans; Employment Opportunities; *Employment Patterns; *Employment Statistics; Immigrants; Income; Self Esteem; *Social Status

ABSTRACT

This volume consists of papers which were submitted to the Asian American Assembly conference in New York in 1977. The goals of the Assembly are outlined in the volume's preface. Community and academic activities undertaken by the Assembly in cooperation with the City College of New York Department of Asian Studies are described. In a paper by a Pennsylvania judge, Asian American attitudes are explored. Both attitudes toward one another and attitudes toward oneself are discussed. Steps toward self acceptance and social equality are suggested. In a second paper, by a professor of Asian Studies, employment patterns of Chinese Americans are discussed. The rate of growth of the Chinese population in the U.S. is mentioned as a factor to consider in the employment outlook for 1980. The question of whether traditional employment patterns will serve future needs is also addressed. Language education and job training, as well as the utilization of affirmative action channels, are suggested as ways of improving opportunities. Data on the occupational distribution of Chinese Americans is presented in statistical tables. A list of members of the Asian Assembly is also included in this document. (GC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED154058

Occasional Papers/ Reprints Series in Contemporary Asian Studies

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Hungdah Chiu

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

NUMBER 12 — 1977

ASIAN AMERICAN ASSEMBLY POSITION PAPER: II A REVIEW OF U.S. EMPLOYMENT POLICY

School of Law
University
of
Maryland

UD017969

Occasional Papers/Reprints Series in Contemporary Asian Studies

General Editor: Hungdah Chiu

Executive Editor: David Simon

Assistant Editor: William L. Helfand

Manager: Kennedy Armstrong Brooks

Editorial Advisory Board

Professor Robert A. Scalapino, University of California at Berkeley

Professor Martin Wilbur, Columbia University

Professor Gaston J. Sigur, George Washington University

Professor Shao-chuan Leng, University of Virginia

Professor Lawrence W. Beer, University of Colorado

Professor James Hsiung, New York University

Dr. Robert Heuser, Max-Planck-Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law at Heidelberg

Professor K. P. Misra, Jawaharlal Nehru University, India

Professor J. S. Prybyla, The Pennsylvania State University

Published with the cooperation of the Maryland International Law Society.

All contributions (in English only) and communications should be sent to Professor Hungdah Chiu, University of Maryland School of Law, 500 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201 USA.

All publications in this series reflect only the views of the authors.

While the editor accepts responsibility for the selection of materials to be published, the individual author is responsible for statements of facts and expressions of opinion contained therein.

Subscription is US $10.00 for 10 issues (regardless of the price of individual issues) in the United States and Canada and $12.00 for overseas. Check should be addressed to OPRSCAS and sent to Professor Hungdah Chiu.

Price for single copy of this issue: US $1.00

©1977 by Occasional Papers/Reprints Series in Contemporary Asian Studies, Inc.

ASIAN AMERICAN ASSEMBLY POSITION PAPER II
A REVIEW OF U.S. EMPLOYMENT POLICY

(Abstracts)

CONTENTS

Foreword	Henry Luce III	1
Preface	Winberg Chai	3
Asian American Attitudes	William M. Marutani ..	5
Employment Policy Recommendations	Betty Lee Sung	9
Table 1. Social Distance Ranks of Americans, 1926-1976 .		13
Table 2. Selected Occupations of the Chinese in the U.S., 1970		14
Table 3. Major Occupational Groups of the Chinese in the U.S. by Decades and Percent, 1940-1970		19
Table 4. Major Occupation Groups of the Chinese in the U.S. by Percent Distribution for Selected SMSA's by Sex, 1970		20
National Advisory Council of the Asian American Assembly		21

FOREWORD

The formation of The Asian American Assembly for Policy Research has been a welcome event to me for a number of reasons. First, because a knowledge of Asia among Americans continues to be inadequate, despite the long history of U.S. relations and initiatives with that continent. American perceptions of Asia have tended to be distorted by the cycles of history, fired-up at one moment by involvement in Asian wars, and then receding at another into the mists of isolationist reaction. Meanwhile, an expert elite of non-Asian Americans tends to impose views that can be precious, recondite and self-serving. The growing presence in the academic establishment of scholars of Asian origin is a resource which can elevate the validity of research and opinion in this process. And the Assembly can contribute to giving that resource a voice.

Second, as the number of Asian immigrants to the U.S. accelerates, it has been becoming more and more important that they be assimilated into the fabric of American society. Before they form major interest groups which seek special advantage to overcome perceived discriminations, and thus add to a proliferating fragmentation of the American nation, they must be helped to understand their American surroundings, and thus to achieve Americanhood. The intellectual leadership among them has a role to play in this process, and the Assembly can help to focus on that role.

Third, there has not been any commonality among Asian-Americans to begin with. Japanese, Chinese, Koreans, Filipinos, Indians and the others see themselves as much distinct from each other as they do from other Americans. So the Assembly has a role in bringing them together, and in providing them with an opportunity to address common problems and to share common goals.

I was pleased to accept Professor Winberg Chai's invitation to be chairman of the Assembly's advisory council because a non-Asian American component of such an undertaking is obviously indicated and because of my own identification with the values I have mentioned. The Henry Luce Foundation, Inc., of which I am president, fosters American knowledge of Asia through its Scholars Program, which gives young Americans of high potential a year's experience in Asia, and through its Asian Studies Program, which supports scholarly work in Asian-American interactions at major university graduate centers. In

the field of recent Asian immigrants, China Institute in America, of which I am chairman, conducts bilingual vocational training programs.

The papers in the present volume (abstracts) are those which were submitted to the Assembly's conference in New York in April, 1977. I look forward to the publication of additional reports on other subjects from the Assembly's conferences.

Henry Luce III

Preface

The foundation of the Asian American Assembly was begun in 1972 when the City College of New York received an initial grant of $25,000 from the Field Foundation of New York to help the Department of Asian Studies in developing a "viable City College-run community service program for Chinatown." One year later, President Robert E. Marshak provided an additional $6,000 from the City College Fund to expand the college-run community service program. In 1976, the City College received a second $25,000 grant from the Field Foundation to continue community related projects, including the establishment of the Asian American Assembly for Policy Research. In Spring, 1977, additional contributions were made to the Asian American Assembly from the City College Fund.

The goals of the Asian American Assembly are threefold: First, the identification and recommendation for solutions to the major problems confronting Asian Americans. Second, research and publications by national panels appointed by the Assembly to generate a permanent body of information that may be useful as resource materials. Finally, the Assembly should provide a forum of scholars, community leaders and business executives on a regular basis — persons who can bring together both theoretical discipline and practical experience in the Asian American community.

During 1976, the City College's Asian American Assembly in cooperation with the Department of Asian Studies has sponsored five seminars, two major workshops and one regional conference. Approximately one hundred specialists in education, social work and community leaders have participated in these workshops and conferences. Community organizations represented including the following:

Chinatown Health and Service Center
Chinatown Improvement Council
Chinatown Manpower Project
Chinatown Planning Council
Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association
Immigrant Social Services
Project Ahead
Two Bridges Neighborhood Council, etc.

During 1977, the Asian American Assembly has convened a national conference on April 29–30 on five main subjects: (1)

Bilingual and Bicultural Education for Chinese Americans; (2) Teaching English to Chinese Speakers; (3) Social Services and Immigration Policies for Asian Americans; (4) Problems of Immigrant Youth; and (5) A Review of United States-China Relations. More than fifty papers will be published by the Assembly when funds become available.

The Assembly is fortunate to have the participation of more than one hundred distinguished leaders from fourteen states and Washington, D.C. in business, education and community affairs to formulate the first National Advisory Council (1977-1978). Under the leadership of Mr. Henry Luce III and Judge William Marutani of Philadelphia, the National Advisory Council includes chairmen of several large corporations as well as owners of small businesses, university administrators as well as chair professors from thirty colleges and universities, and leaders from eighteen diversified community organizations such as, China Institute in America, Japan Society, as well as Jewish Community Council of New York. We are also grateful to Prof. Harry H. L. Kitano, UCLA, Prof. Jang H. Koo, University of Alaska at Fairbanks, and Prof. William T. Liu, Director of Asian American Mental Health Research Center at Chicago to serve as vice-chairmen and to guide the activities of the Assembly in the years ahead.

The views expressed in the position papers on employment policy (abstracts) are those of the authors and not those of the Asian American Assembly or of the City College Fund or of the Field Foundation, which as educational institutions take no official position.

Winberg Chai
Chairman

New York City

ASIAN AMERICAN ATTITUDES

BY WILLIAM M. MARUTANI

Judge, Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia

I should like to explore with you some perspectives of Asian American attitudes: first, our attitudes toward one another; second, our attitudes of ourselves.

Perhaps we need to openly state at the outset and recognize why we are gathered here: it is racial prejudice within our society. Historically, there has been a peculiar strain of racial bias hosting upon peoples of the yellow and brown races, infringing upon citizenship rights, immigration, land ownership, right to certain occupational pursuits, housing, the incarceration of 115,000 Asians, — three-fourths of them American citizens, — placed behind barbed-wire camps during World War II, solely because of race. Asian race.

Even in our language, the term "yellow" is used to denote derogatory concepts. For example, "yellow journalism", "yellow-dog contract", and cowardice is expressed as "yellow stripe down his back" — when we all know that a skunk, in fact, has a white stripe down his back. Then there's "Yellow Peril", the very sound of which is threatening. Just try "White Peril" and you'll understand what I mean.

Our proud Nation has dehumanized Asians by labelling them "gooks", "slopes", and so forth, further perpetuating racism and hatred toward persons of Asian extraction. Out of the Vietnam war we read of our troops wearing necklaces made of Asian ears: one never heard of such things occurring during our fighting in Europe. We also read of grenades being tossed into buses loaded with Asian women, children and elderly, simply as a joke. We never heard of such atrocities occurring in the European Theatre.

Race prejudice is not a polite topic; one cannot speak of it in a polite manner or in polite terms.

It is ironical that if I were a white American saying these things, I would be praised as being sensitive, compassionate, and understanding; yet, when the same truths are spoken by a person with an Asian face, we are prone to labelling the speaker as an agitator, dismissing him as a malcontent, or condemning him as subversive.

Then there are those who say, "anyway, this is still the best system in the world." And while that may be true, give that explanation to the Asian American child who has just been

taunted as "ching-chong" in the schoolyard; or to the Asian American who has been by-passed for promotion; or to the hopeful Asian American couple denied housing. The This-is-still-the-Best-Place argument may be true for some. At best, it is just another way of saying "Things could be worse."

Aside from simply uniting to combat racial prejudice, there are affirmative reasons why Asian Americans should come together. We share many common cultural and ethical values of the family and community mores. Even those of us who are not Buddhists find a sympathetic strain among its teachings. Our mythology has several common roots. For example, the mythology of my Japanese parents has roots stemming from the Chinese, Mongols and Polynesians. The Japanese legend of the sun god is found upon the legend of Panku in Chinese lore; the story of the parents of this same sun god has striking similarities to a legend familiar to Polynesians; and the three sacred treasures of Japanese culture, — the sacred sword, mirror and jewels, — are also ancient symbols of Mongolian mythology.

Yet candor compels it to be said that unfortunately there exist reservations, suspicion and condescension between and among Asian Americans. To deal with this, we must speak openly about it. Let us cast aside these false obstacles from our midst; let those of us who are of goodwill come together to work for the common betterment of all. Racial discrimination is *non*-discriminatory in its preying upon us: what affects any one of you affects me, all of us, and vice versa.

Let us turn to an examination of our attitudes of ourselves. Some Asian Americans seek as their objectives, "acceptance" and "equality". I should like to suggest to you that both of these concepts are inherently demeaning and thus insidiously perpetuate racism. Let me explain.

"Acceptance" by definition must involve an "acceptor" and an "acceptee". I need not tell you which one you are. This land is *our* land: it belongs to you and to me. Our forebearers built this Nation, working in the mines, laying the railroad tracks across its vast expanse, working its soil. We need not be "accepted" in our own home, our own land.

Similarly, the goal of "equality" is demeaning. I ask you: Equal to whom? Are we being urged to be "equal" to Black Americans? Or Hispanic-Americans? Or could it just be white Americans? Again by definition, the concept implies a superior-inferior relationship: that there is some superior standard to which we are exhorted to be "equal" to.

If Asian Americans are to become "equal", say, in the area of educational achievement, let us examine some U. S. Government statistics. Of Americans 25 years of age and above, 11% have completed at least four years of college. If Japanese Americans wish to become equal, then they should drop from 16% down to 11%, Pilipino Americans from 22%, Chinese Americans from 26%, and Korean Americans from 36.3%.

In terms of income, the 1969 national median was $9,500. Again, Japanese Americans to be "equal" must slacken off from $12,500, Chinese Americans from $10,600. Only our fellow Pilipino Americans were below the median at $9,300.

The F.B.I. crime statistics show arrest records of 66% for white Americans, 30% for Black Americans, 2.7% for Native Americans, Japanese Americans with one-tenth of 1%, and Chinese Americans with about one-half of even that. (I am puzzled how Japanese Americans have a higher income than Chinese Americans when the latter are better educated. Perhaps it's because Japanese Americans commit twice as many crimes.)

In closing, we should not permit ourselves to be "sold a bill of goods" with demeaning concepts of "acceptance" and "equality" with their inherent implications of a superior-inferior relationship. Asian Americans are neither superior nor inferior. We are simply equal to ourselves.

Secondly, let us be rightfully proud of the unique culture and dignified ethics that we can share with our fellow Americans.

Thirdly, believe in your own worth: each of you has much to be proud of.

Fourthly, let us thrust aside the false obstacles that some would seek to place between us as fellow Asian Americans.

Finally, let us, now, change from talking and move into acting, working together. To refer very briefly but to a few areas to which we Asian Americans must direct our combined energies, there are the areas of: politics — as committee persons, ward leaders, and of course as public servants; legislative lobbying — to change our laws to promote fairness for the many neglected within our midst; and litigation, court suits — to correct injustices and imbalances that persist in our society.

W.M.M.

EMPLOYMENT POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS: LOOKING TO 1980

BY BETTY LEE SUNG

Associate Professor of Asian Studies at the City College of New York

This is a very significant occasion in the history of the Asian Studies Dept. of CCNY. We have convened a conference on Chinese Americans. This is another step toward the goal of establishing the Asian Studies Dept. as the center of Chinese American scholarship on the East Coast.

I shall not take too much time for my topic on "Employment Policy Recommendations: Looking to 1980." I have already put out a number of publications on the topic both in article form and in book form. My report to the Dept. of Labor, the culmination of three years of research and study has gone into a hardcover book put out by Praeger Publishers, and many of my recommendations are contained in that volume. Besides, I have many learned colleagues with me on the panel with much data to impart, so I shall make my presentation very brief.

In my opinion, the two most important factors to consider in employment outlook for 1980 is the rate of growth of the Chinese population in the U.S. and whether the traditional employment pattern will serve our needs in the future.

Of one thing I am sure: The Chinese population will continue to increase primarily from immigration at the rate of 23,000 to 26,000 per year exceeding the national quota permitted as under the 1965 law. The reasons for this are:

1. Those immigrants who have been here for a sufficient period of time to obtain citizenship can bring their immediate families to this country on a non-quota basis.
2. Many Chinese are making intermediary hops, first to another country, and then to the U.S. so that they do not come under the Chinese quota, but rather under the quota of the country from which they last resided. Nevertheless, when they arrive in the U.S., they will gravitate to Chinatowns and cleave to the Chinese communities.
3. The birth rate of the Chinese population in the U.S. is extremely low, so that eventually a larger and larger proportion of our population will be foreign-born, at least in the foreseeable future.

Consequently I project an estimated Chinese population of three-quarters of a million by the year 1980, largely foreign-born, largely settled on the East coast, in the adult age group, not as highly skilled and educated as the immigrants of the 1960s, and these people will be needing employment as soon as they arrive.

What is our occupational picture now? First, there is heavy concentration in a limited number of fields and occupations. For example, one out of every six persons employed is in the restaurant business. One-half of the women employed in New York City works in the garment industry. One-fifth of all Chinese employed is on a government payroll rather than in the private sector. One-third are in a few professions such as engineering, science, and teaching.

Obviously there is a need for diversification. The restaurant and garment industries, providing the bulk of employment to new immigrants, are oversaturated. Recent immigrants are not likely to get into the professions or on the government payroll. A recent article in the *New York Times* stated that the garment industry is vacating New York City for the southern cities where labor unions are weak and wages lower. Else garments are being sewn in Caribbean or Asian countries where wages are yet lower. By 1980, much of the occupational base of the Chinese women will have been eroded with perhaps disastrous effect upon the Chinese American community.

Presently the wages of female garment workers supplement the wages of the male restaurant worker, so that the family income is sufficient to maintain the families, and the male wages in the restaurant can remain low so that prices can also stay low enough to support the more than 230 restaurants in New York's Chinatown. The decline of one industry where the Chinese females are so dependent upon their income is bound to have drastic repercussions on another industry where the Chinese males are so heavily concentrated. I want to call attention to this problem now, and I think that our social planners and community leaders should begin searching for other areas of employment now.

Dispersion not only means looking for other types of work in other industries, but also away from the overpopulated centers of New York City, San Francisco and Honolulu. Already, there has been a marked decline of Chinese population away from Honolulu, and to a lesser extent San Francisco, but New York is gaining Chinese population at a phenomenal rate. Such a rapid rate of increase calls for preplanning now. I think it is the responsibility

of us scholars and researchers to call attention to this fact, but it is the responsibility of our community and government leaders to effect programs for change so that the economic impact will be gradual rather than drastic.

I call upon our leaders now to institute programs for change. This means more English language classes for the foreign-born, job referral programs to get Chinese into nontraditional occupations, job training programs to prepare those with outmoded skills to go into other lines of work, and career workshops for professionals and skilled technicians. In my opinion, one of the weakest areas in the expansion of jobs, even with college graduates, is that they do not know how to go about looking for a job. Academicians may view career workshops as non-academic, but what is the use of an engineering degree if one does not know how to go about becoming an engineer?

The realities of this expansion into nontraditional jobs for the Chinese will meet with a great deal of resistance from scaremongers who are afraid for their jobs, from unions who want to preserve their domains, from racists who think all Chinese are foreigners and that jobs should go first to white Americans, and from many who don't mind the Chinese having the menial jobs, but are relucatnt for them to get the better jobs.

The reaction will come, and I think we should be prepared for this eventuality. Therefore, preplanning means more than preparing for an occupation, learning the language, and going to where the jobs are. For us, as a minority group, it also means preparing society to accept us as competents, as equal, and as colleagues.

Some of us may protest: Why should the burden of acceptance fall upon us? A good question, but the realities of the situation at this point in time is that we are in this disadvantaged position. Either we make some effort to extricate ourselves, or we wait passively until the social climate improves, but that will be way beyond the year 1980.

The fact of the matter is, in terms of social distance, the Chinese are still pretty far down on the totem pole. In a survey of approximately 2,600 people selected from places throughout the United States, Emory Bogardus found that the Chinese usually ranked somewhere between 21st to 26th among 30 ethnic groups. (See Table 1) In 1926, the Chinese ranked lower than Negroes. Forty years later, their position had improved, but not too much.[1]

1. Emory Bogardus, "Comparing Racial Distance in Ethiopia, South Africa and the United States," *Sociology and Social Research*, 1968 (52: 149–156).

In 1976, Won Moo Hurh used the Bogardus scale with 120 of his students in a sociology class at a Mid-Western college. He found that the Chinese position had slipped to 28th out of 31 groups in the survey.[2]

Hurh's findings are not conclusive, but they do provide cause for concern. If we are held in low esteem, our upward mobility undoubtedly will be limited. If our public image is negative, our job opportunities will be likewise. So a new dimension must be added to the task of broadening our employment horizon — that of destroying the old stereotypes and creating for ourselves a more positive image.

As we forge ahead into competition for some of the upper strata jobs, we are going to meet with resistance. We should plan now on strategies to deal with the reactions. We should try to make effective use of the Affirmative Action machinery that has been set up for minority groups. Unfortunately, most Chinese Americans are not acquainted with the provisions of this legislation to derive the greatest benefits from it.

Looking to 1980, I see greater employment opportunities and attainment for the Chinese in the United States, but as we advance, I also see steeper heights that we must scale.

---

2. Won Moo Hurh, "Comparative Study of Korean Immigrants in the United States," a paper presented at the 1976 meeting of Korean Christian Scholars in North American, Chicago.

APPENDIX

Table 1.

Social Distance Ranks of Americans, 1926-1976

Target Group	1926	1946	1956	1966	1976
English	1.0	3.0	3.0	2.0	2.0
Americans (U.S., white)	2.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Canadians	3.5	2.0	2.0	3.0	4.0
Scots	3.5	5.0	7.0	9.0	8.0
Irish	5.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	7.0
French	6.0	6.0	4.0	4.0	5.0
Germans	7.0	10.0	8.0	10.5	9.0
Swedish	8.0	9.0	6.0	6.0	3.0
Hollanders	9.0	8.0	9.0	10.5	10.0
Norwegians	10.0	7.0	10.0	7.0	11.0
Spanish	11.0	15.0	14.0	14.0	17.0
Finns	12.0	11.0	11.0	12.0	16.0
Russians	13.0	13.0	22.0	22.0	22.0
Italians	14.0	16.0	12.0	8.0	6.0
Poles	15.0	14.0	13.0	16.0	14.0
Armenians	16.0	17.5	18.0	19.0	15.0
Czechs	17.0	12.0	17.0	17.0	20.0
Indians (Amer.)	18.0	20.0	19.0	18.0	13.0
Jews	19.0	19.0	16.0	15.0	18.0
Greeks	20.0	17.5	15.0	13.0	12.0
Mexicans	21.0	23.5	26.0	26.5	19.0
Japanese	22.0	28.0	24.0	23.0	23.0
Filipinos	23.0	22.0	20.0	20.0	27.0
Negroes	24.0	27.0	25.0	26.5	31.0
Turks	25.0	23.5	21.0	24.0	24.0
Chinese	26.0	21.0	23.0	21.0	28.0
Koreans	27.0	25.0	28.0	25.0	30.0
Indians (India)	28.0	26.0	27.0	28.0	29.0

Source: 1926-1966 Emory Bogardus (1958; 1966)
1976 Won Moo Hurh (1976)

APPENDIX

Table 2

Selected Occupations of the Chinese in the U.S., 1970

Selected Occupations	Male	Female	Total	%
Total 16 Years and Over	113,929	67,261	181,190	100.0%
Professional, Technical & Kindred Workers	34,436	13,565	48,001	26.5%
Accountants	2,073	823	2,896	1.6%
Architects	596	44	640	0.4%
Computer Specialists	1,288	414	1,702	0.9%
Engineers	8,780	82	8,862	4.9%
Aeronautical & astronautical	510	0	510	0.3%
Chemical	531	0	531	0.3%
Civil	2,222	40	2,262	1.2%
Electrical & electronic	2,588	22	2,610	1.4%
Industrial	148	0	148	0.1%
Mechanical	892	20	912	0.5%
Lawyers & Judges	327	45	372	0.2%
Librarians, Archivists & Curators	234	561	795	0.4%
Mathematical Specialists	122	154	276	0.2%
Life and Physical Scientists	2,244	582	2,826	1.6%
Biological	382	126	508	0.3%
Chemists	1,353	417	1,770	1.0%
Physicists and astronomers	278	19	297	0.2%
Personnel and Labor Relations Workers	340	83	423	0.2%
Physicians, Dentists & Related Practitioners	3,344	586	3,930	2.2%
Dentists	423	0	423	0.2%
Pharmacists	591	156	747	0.4%
Physicians, medical & osteopathic	2,200	408	2,608	1.4%
Registered Nurses, Dieticians & Therapists	156	1,413	1,569	0.9%
Health Technologists & Technicians	373	1,073	1,446	0.8%
Religious Workers	196	27	223	0.1%
Social Scientists	285	94	379	0.2%
Social and Recreation Workers	372	461	833	0.5%
Teachers, College & University	4,059	1,005	5,064	2.8%
Biology	99	57	156	0.1%
Chemistry	244	74	318	0.2%
Physics	389	0	389	0.2%
Engineering	545	0	545	0.3%
Mathematics	318	88	406	0.2%
Health specialties	181	121	302	0.2%
Psychology	54	24	78	0.0%
Economics	103	21	124	0.1%

Table 2 — Continued

Selected Occupations of the Chinese in the U.S., 1970

Selected Occupations	Male	Female	Total	%
History	116	40	156	0.1%
English	96	79	175	0.1%
Foreign Language	150	104	254	0.1%
Teachers, Except College & University	1,209	3,332	4,541	2.5%
Elementary School	198	1,866	2,064	1.1%
Pre-kindergarten & kindergarten	0	379	379	0.2%
Secondary School	807	675	1,482	0.8%
Engineering and Science Technicians	3,189	442	3,631	2.0%
Chemical	244	64	308	0.2%
Draftsmen	1,457	170	1,627	0.9%
Electrical & electronic engineering	839	0	839	0.5%
Writers, Artists and Entertainers	2,020	651	2,671	1.5%
Designers	467	257	724	0.4%
Editors & reporters	190	125	315	0.2%
Painters & sculptors	407	68	475	0.3%
Photographers	282	20	302	0.2%
Public relations men & publicity writers	108	66	174	0.1%
Writers, artists & entertainers n.e.c.	293	75	368	0.2%
Research Workers Not Specified	1,961	766	2,727	1.5%
Managers and Administrators Except Farm	13,189	2,868	16,057	8.9%
Bank Officers and Financial Managers	375	239	614	0.3%
Buyers, Wholesale & Retail Trade	303	200	503	0.3%
Managers and Superintendants, Building	200	119	319	0.2%
Officials and Administrators, Public Admnstrn. N.E.C.	397	66	463	0.3%
Federal public administration & postal service	336	45	381	0.2%
Restaurant, Cafeteria & Bar Managers	3,207	546	3,753	2.1%
Sales Managers & Dept. Heads, Retail Trade	352	0	352	0.2%
Managers & Administrators N.E.C. Salaried	3,328	596	3,924	2.2%
Construction	181	0	181	0.1%
Durable goods, manufacturing	228	0	228	0.1%
Non-durable goods inc. not spec. manuf.	391	79	470	0.3%
Transportation	267	66	333	0.2%
Wholesale trade	333	0	333	0.2%
Retail trade	1,051	293	1,344	0.7%
General merchandise stores	116	52	168	0.1%
Food stores	571	132	703	0.4%
Finance, insurance & real estate	200	0	200	0.1%

Table 2 — Continued

Selected Occupations of the Chinese in the U.S., 1970

Selected Occupations	Male	Female	Total	%
Business & repair services	180	36	216	0.1%
Personnel services	320	20	340	0.2%
Managers & Administrators N.E.C.				
Self-Employed	4,020	847	4,867	2.7%
Wholesale trade	277	28	305	0.2%
Retail trade	2,161	434	2,595	1.4%
Food stores	1,805	317	2,122	1.2%
Personnel services	1,203	324	1,527	0.8%
Sales Workers	4,690	3,180	7,870	4.3%
Insurance Agents, Brokers & Underwriters	504	98	602	0.3%
Real Estate Agents & Brokers	236	34	270	0.1%
Stock & Bond Salesmen	306	20	326	0.2%
Salesmen & Sales Clerk N.E.C.	3,107	2,812	5,919	3.3%
Sales representatives, wholesale trade	569	72	641	0.4%
Sales clerks, retail trade	2,066	2,458	4,524	2.5%
General merchandise stores	275	1,102	1,377	0.8%
Food stores	1,047	450	1,497	0.8%
Apparel & accessories stores	128	176	304	0.2%
Clerical and Kindred Workers	9,768	20,736	30,504	16.8%
Bank Tellers	117	600	717	0.4%
Bookkeepers	731	2,166	2,897	1.6%
Cashiers	1,354	2,485	3,839	2.1%
Counter Clerks, Except Food	267	253	520	0.3%
Estimators & Investigators N.E.C.	182	257	439	0.2%
Expediters & Production Controllers	240	83	323	0.2%
File Clerks	521	552	1,073	0.6%
Library Attendants & Assistants	252	510	762	0.4%
Mail Carriers, Post Office	517	32	549	0.3%
Office Machine Operators	649	1,605	2,254	1.2%
Postal Clerks	706	302	1,008	0.6%
Receptionists	22	410	432	0.2%
Secretaries	153	2,924	3,077	1.7%
Shipping & Receiving Clerks	482	66	548	0.3%
Statistical Clerks	207	450	657	0.4%
Stenographers	21	247	268	0.1%
Stock Clerks & Storekeepers	613	294	907	0.5%
Telephone Operators	69	327	396	0.2%
Ticket, Station & Express Agents	130	164	294	0.2%
Typists	206	2,958	3,164	1.7%
Craftsmen and Kindred Workers	8,789	1,060	9,849	5.4%
Bakers	278	85	363	0.2%

Table 2 — Continued

Selected Occupations of the Chinese in the U.S., 1970

Selected Occupations	Male	Female	Total	%
Construction Craftsmen	1,748	19	1,767	1.0%
Carpenters	569	19	588	0.3%
Electricians	580	0	580	0.3%
Plumbers & Pipe Fitters	255	0	255	0.1%
Mechanics & Repairmen	2,463	143	2,606	1.4%
Aircraft	370	46	416	0.2%
Automobile mechanics	718	21	739	0.4%
Radio & television	508	17	525	0.3%
Metal Craftsmen Except Mechanics	566	26	592	0.3%
Machinists	215	8	223	0.1%
Printing Craftsmen	464	116	580	0.3%
Tailors	333	106	439	0.2%
Telephone Installers & Repairmen	231	0	231	0.1%
Operatives Except Transport	9,914	15,025	24,939	13.8%
Assemblers	269	332	601	0.3%
Checkers, Examiners & Inspectors; Manufacturing	284	138	422	0.2%
Clothing Ironers & Pressers	1,408	686	2,094	1.2%
Cutting Operatives N.E.C.	123	120	243	0.1%
Dressmakers & Seamstresses, Except Factory	17	222	239	0.1%
Garage Workers & Gas Station Attendants	734	0	734	0.4%
Laundry & Dry Cleaning Operatives N.E.C.	1,921	860	2,781	1.5%
Meat Cutters & Butchers, Exc. Manufacturing	1,572	81	1,653	0.9%
Metalworking Operatives, Exc. Precision Machines	280	104	384	0.2%
Packers & Wrappers, Except Meat & Produce	256	583	839	0.5%
Sewers & Stitchers	185	9,801	9,986	5.5%
Transport Equipment Operatives	1,824	32	1,856	1.0%
Deliverymen & Routemen	484	13	497	0.3%
Truck Drivers	389	19	408	0.2%
Laborers, Except Farm	3,597	650	4,247	2.3%
Freight & Material Handlers	152	66	218	0.1%
Stock Handlers	1,417	305	1,722	1.0%
Farmers & Farm Managers	421	78	499	0.3%
Farm Laborers & Farm Foremen	260	217	477	0.3%

Table 2 — Continued

Selected Occupations of the Chinese in the U.S., 1970

Selected Occupations	Male	Female	Total	%
Service Workers, Except Private Household	26,724	8,742	35,466	19.6%
Cleaning Service Workers	1,545	445	1,990	1.1%
Food Service Workers	22,302	5,567	27,869	15.4%
Bartenders	764	43	807	0.4%
Busboys	1,390	94	1,484	0.8%
Cooks, exc. private household	11,433	1,350	12,783	7.1%
Dishwashers	1,127	442	1,569	0.9%
Food counter & fountain workers	119	220	339	0.2%
Waiters	6,211	2,532	8,743	4.8%
Food service workers, n.e.c. exc. priv. household.	1,258	886	2,144	1.2%
Health Service Workers	340	764	1,104	0.6%
Personal Service Workers	625	990	1,615	0.9%
Hairdressers & cosmetologists	27	431	458	0.3%
Protective Service Workers	377	62	439	0.2%
Private Household Workers	317	1,108	1,425	0.8

Source: U.S. Census Subject Report PC(2)7A

APPENDIX

Table 3

Major Occupational Groups of the Chinese in the United States by Decades and Percent, 1940-1970

Major Occupational Groups	1940	1950	1960	1970
Total Employed	36,454	48,409	98,784	181,190
Professional Technical	2.8%	7.1%	17.9%	26.5%
Managers	20.6	19.8	12.7	8.9
Sales Workers	11.4	15.9	6.6	4.3
Clerical Workers	11.4	15.9	13.8	16.8
Craftsmen	1.2	2.9	5.2	5.4
Operators	22.6	17.1	15.0	14.8
Laborers, except farmers	0.7	1.7	1.3	2.3
Farmers	3.8	2.6	1.0	0.6
Service Workers	30.4	28.8	18.8	19.6
Private Household Workers	6.2	2.6	1.0	0.8
Not Reported	0.3	1.5	6.5	——

Source: U.S. Decennial Censuses

APPENDIX

Table 4

Major Occupation Groups of the Chinese in the U.S. by Percent Distribution for Selected SMSA's by Sex, 1970

Major Occupation Groups	Boston	Chicago	Honolulu	L.A. Long Beach	New York	Sacramento	S.F. Oakland	San Jose	Seattle Everett	D.C.-Va. Md.
Males Employed 16 Yrs.+	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Professional, Technical	27.5	31.7	22.2	32.0	18.6	25.5	19.8	50.5	25.1	47.9
Managers	10.2	9.4	14.1	10.9	10.3	14.5	10.3	9.1	13.7	10.1
Sales Workers	1.2	3.7	6.5	5.7	4.5	3.6	5.9	4.9	3.9	1.2
Clerical Workers	6.8	7.8	11.4	10.5	8.3	13.5	14.8	7.3	9.2	6.1
Craftsmen	2.4	4.0	20.0	6.1	4.3	5.4	9.7	6.0	7.6	3.6
Operatives	7.9	9.4	8.9	12.3	15.7	9.8	12.3	5.5	4.9	3.8
Laborers, exc. farm	2.3	2.2	5.2	3.5	1.7	6.2	3.5	2.3	2.2	2.8
Farmers, Mgrs. & Laborers	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.2	0.1	2.6	0.3	7.0	0.2	0.2
Service Workers	41.5	31.1	11.2	18.6	36.0	19.0	22.7	7.1	33.2	25.4
Private Household Workers	0	0.3	0	0.3	0.5	0	0.7	0.3	0	0.9
Females Employed 16 Yrs.+										
Professional, Technical	15.6	22.7	18.9	20.3	14.0	13.3	10.9	32.4	18.6	34.4
Managers	0.6	1.7	5.4	3.5	3.6	3.9	3.2	2.7	2.5	4.3
Sales Workers	3.8	2.4	9.4	5.3	3.4	3.5	5.8	5.4	5.9	4.4
Clerical Workers	28.5	30.4	37.5	33.9	25.4	43.6	38.2	29.9	24.2	29.9
Craftsmen	0	2.0	1.9	0.7	1.4	0.8	1.6	0.8	0.4	0.8
Operatives	39.6	23.4	8.2	25.6	43.7	14.1	26.3	7.7	29.6	5.7
Laborers, exc. farm	0.5	1.4	1.0	0.4	0.7	1.4	0.5	1.3	1.5	0.4
Farmers, Mgrs. & Laborers	0.3	0	0.5	0.1	0	1.3	0.3	12.0	0.8	0
Service Workers	9.9	14.8	16.5	8.3	5.6	13.8	11.1	6.4	14.9	14.2
Private Household Workers	1.2	1.2	0.7	2.1	2.1	4.2	2.2	1.4	1.6	5.9

Source: U.S. Census Special Report PC(2) 1G

THE ASIAN AMERICAN ASSEMBLY FOR POLICY RESEARCH, CCNY, New York 10031

PROF. WINBERG CHAI, *Chairman*

THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL, 1977-1978

MR. HENRY LUCE III, New York City, *Chairman*
JUDGE WILLIAM M. MARUTANI, Philadelphia, *Co-Chairman*
PROF. HARRY H. L. KITANO, Los Angeles, *Vice-Chairman*
PROF. JANG H. KOO, Fairbanks, Alaska, *Vice-Chairman*
PROF. WILLIAM T. LIU, Chicago, *Vice-Chairman*

MEMBERS

PROF. FEDERICO AQUINO-BERMUDEZ, CCNY
MR. BHARAT BHARGARVA, Philadelphia National Bank (tentative)
DR. CH'U CHAI, New York City
MRS. CAROLYN EVERETT CHAI, Environmental Commission, Pequannock, NJ
PROF. ALOYSIUS CHANG, Washington State U. at Pullman
MS. DIANA CHANG, PEN, New York City
PROF. EUGENIO CHANG-RODRIGUEZ, Queens College
PROF. TEH-KUANG CHANG, Ball State U. (Indiana)
PROF. Y. C. CHANG, U. of Delaware
PROF. GEORGE PO-CHUNG CHEN, Augusta College (Georgia)
PROF. KING C. CHEN, Rutgers U.
DR. THEODORE H. E. CHEN, Los Angeles
MR. WILLIAM L. Y. CHEN, New York City
PROF. DAVID H. CHENG, CCNY
PROF. TAO CHENG, Trenton State College
DR. ANNA CHENNAULT, Washington, D.C.
PROF. C. P. CHEUNG, Calif. State at L. A.
MR. HARRY CHIN, NYC
PROF. JULIA CHING, Yale U.
PROF. HUNGDAH CHIU, U. of Maryland Law School
MS. NORMA CHU, educator, NYC
MR. STANLEY CHU, educator, NYC
MR. AUGUSTINE CHUA, Immigrant Social Service, NYC
DR. PRISCILLA CHUNG, Asian American Council of Greater Philadelphia
MR. ALLEN B. COHEN, Chinatown Planning Council, NYC
PROF. F. HILARY CONROY, U. of Pennsylvania

DR. CHARLES E. EISENHART, President, Adirondack College — SUNY
MR. ROBERT W. FAIRBURN, Fairburn Associates, Phoenix
MISS JESSICA FEINGOLD, The Jewish Theological Seminary of America
PROF. FUMIKO IKEDA FEINGOLD, CCNY
PROF. THOMAS WILSON GETHING, U. of Hawaii at Manoa
PROF. IRVING GREENBERG, CCNY
DR. FELIKS GROSS, The Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, NYC
MRS. CYNTHIA HO, educator, NYC
MR. MALCOLM HOENLEIN, Jewish Community Relations Council of New York
MRS. JOSEPHINE M. HONG, Chinese Women's Benevolent Association, NYC
PROF. CHAO-MIN HSIEH, U. of Pittsburgh
PROF. JAMES C. HSIUNG, NYU
PROF. KING-YI HSU, Andrews U. (Mich.)
MR. F. RICHARD HSU, China Institute in America, NYC
PROF. KAI-LOO HUANG, Moravian College (Pa.)
PROF. JOHN L. JANG, La Verne College (Ca.)
MR. GERALD JANN, JADE MAGAZINE, Los Angeles
PROF. LEONARD JEFFRIES, JR., CCNY
REV. MARK JUNG, Transfiguration Church, NYC
PROF. DIANA KAO, CCNY
PROF. Y. M. KAU, Brown U.
PROF. ILPYONG J. KIM, U. of Connecticut
DR. RICHARD S. KRAMER, educator, NYC
MR. STANLEY KREUTZER, Board of Ethics, City Hall, NYC
DR. PETER KU, Howard Community College, Maryland
DR. P. M. KU, Southwest Research Institute, San Antonio
DR. Y. H. KU, Philadelphia
PROF. NANCY DUKE LAY, CCNY
MR. DAVID W. LEE, The State Education Department, NY
DR. T. KONG LEE, Chancellor, Lincoln U., San Francisco, Sacramento, San Jose
PROF. TA-LING LEE, South Connecticut State College
PROF. SHAO-CHUAN LENG, U. of Virginia
DR. HANG-SHENG LIN, Institute of Pacific Studies, Petaluma, Ca.
PROF. J. B. LIU, U. of Arizona

PROF. K. W. LIU, CCNY
MS. FAY LOO, educator, NYC
MR. DAVID MACEACHRON, Japan Society, Inc., NYC
MS. MAO CHUN-FAN, NYC
MR. MAX R. MENSCH, Borck and Mensch, NYC
PROF. VISHWANATH MORE, Johnston College (Ca.)
MR. WARD MOREHOUSE, Council on International and Public Affairs, NYC
PROF. ROGER K. ODEN, Governors State U., Illinois
PROF. SE JEUNG OH, CCNY
DR. CHOON-HO PARK, Howard U.
MR. ARTHUR H. ROSEN, National Committee on U.S.-China Relations, NYC
MR. EMIL OXFELD, President, American Civil Liberties Union, N.J.
PROF. MICHAEL RYWKIN, CCNY
PROF. BUNJI SAKITA, CCNY
PROF. EVA E. SANDIS, Fordham U.
PROF. CONRAD SCHIROKAUER, CCNY
MR. MITCHELL B. SCHULICH, Seward Park High School, NYC
DR. OTIS H. SHAO, Occidental College
PROF. OSBORNE E. SCOTT, CCNY
REV. DR. CHANG SHENG-YEN, The Buddhist Association of the United States
DR. PAUL K. T. SIH, St. John's U.
PROF. BETTY LEE SUNG, CCNY
REV. PAUL SZTO, Queens Christian Reformed Church, Jamaica
MR. THOMAS TAM, Chinatown Health Clinic, NYC
PROF. CHESTER C. TAN, NYU
PROF. U AUNG THEIN, Columbia
PROF. T. K. TONG, CCNY
MS. LILA TSAI, Board of Education, NYC
MR. C. Y. TUNG (honorary) New York City and Hong Kong
PROF. TIMOTHY TUNG, CCNY
PROF. WILLIAM L. TUNG, Queens College
PROF. BAIDYA N. WARMA, CCNY
MR. CHARLES P. WANG, Chinatown Planning Council, NYC
PROF. GEORGE C. WANG, Calif. State at Dominguez Hills
MR. GEORGE T. C. WANG, New York City
MR. THOMAS K. WANG, Chinatown Service Center, NYC
DR. MARY I. WATANABE, Pacific/Asian Coalition, Philadelphia

REV. FRANKLIN J. WOO, National Council of the Churches of Christ
MR. ALFRED Y. WU, Los Angeles and Las Vegas
MRS. JULIA L. WU, Los Angeles
MS. LORETTA WU, Organization of Chinese Americans, NYC
PROF. PEI-YI WU, Queens College and Columbia U.
PROF. YUAN-LI WU, U. of San Francisco and Hoover Institution
PROF. RICHARD H. YANG, Washington U. at St. Louis
REV. PHILIP YANG, True Light Lutheran Church, NYC
PROF. JOHN YOUNG, Seton Hall U.
PROF. LUNG-CHANG YOUNG, Hobart & William Smith Colleges
MR. N. T. YUNG, Bridge Magazine, NYC
DEAN FREDERICK T. C. YU, Columbia U.